



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/553,169

11/28/2005

Roger R. C. New

117-565

7760

23117 7590 08/05/2008
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

HA, JULIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1654

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/553,169	Applicant(s) NEW, ROGER R. C.	
	Examiner JULIE HA	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,9-14,19-24 and 26-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,9-14,19-24 and 26-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/14/2008, 3/3/2008, 6/20/2008, 7/9/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment after Non-final rejection filed on June 20, 2008 is acknowledged. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-14, 19-24 and 26-35 are pending in this application and examined on the merits in this office action.

Withdrawn Rejections

1. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are hereby withdrawn in view of Applicant's persuasive arguments. However, under further review, revised 103 rejection follows below.

New Rejection-35 U.S.C. 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1654

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-14 and 26-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over New (US Patent No. 5,853,748) in view of Desai (US Patent No. 5,206,219) and Sonnenberg & Kotchen (Curr. Op. Neph. Hyperten., 1998, 7, 551-555).

5. New teaches a pharmaceutical composition of (i) a biologically active proteinaceous material, oligonucleotide or analogue thereof or polysaccharide; (ii) a bile acid or salt; and (iii) an agent having the ability to adjust the pH of the gut to a value of from 7.5 to 9 (see claim 1). New teaches specific examples of macromolecular principle (insulin), a bile acid (chenodeoxycholic acid) and an additive that buffers the gut to pH 7.5-9 (sodium bicarbonate, example 4), meeting the limitation of claims 9-11 and 19-21. New teaches that sodium carbonate or bicarbonate can increase the solubility of the bile acids (see column 6, lines 4-7), and thus increase the permeability of bioactive through epithelial cells (see column 6, lines 4-19). New further teaches a composition with an enteric coating designed to prevent digestion in the stomach and to permit digestion in the small intestine (see column 7, lines 37-40), meeting the limitation of claims 31-35. New teaches a method of enhancing the absorption of the insulin across the intestinal wall in an animal body comprising administering the insulin/chenodeoxycholic acid/sodium bicarbonate composition, meeting the limitation of claims 24, 26, 32 and 35. Further, the composition comprises less than 5% by weight of water (see table in example 4), meeting the limitations of claims 2 and 22. New teaches that the additive, sodium bicarbonate, is present at 8.3% by weight which is greater than 1% (table in Example 4). The ratio by weight of the chenodeoxycholic acid plus the additive to the insulin is 10:1 which is greater than 5:1 (table in Example 4). New

Art Unit: 1654

teaches that the composition is in the form of a solution (see column 7, lines 5-55) or a solid (example 4), meeting the limitation of claims 6-7 and 23. The composition sensitizes the subject to insulin by increasing uptake (see example 4), meeting the limitation of claims 11 and 21. The non-conjugated bile acid is chenodeoxycholic acid, the acid form of chenodeoxycholate. New teaches that in general, bile salts start to be converted to their conjugate acid at pH of about 6.8 or below and the acid form is insoluble in aqueous solutions. New teaches that the buffering agent has the effect of buffering the compositions of the composition at a pH of about 7.5 or above, the solubilized bile salt will be present rather than the insoluble bile acid. A solubilized bile salt will be able to act on the epithelial cells when in solution, whereas this may not be possible in the solid acid form (see column 6, lines 6-14). Furthermore, New teaches that the higher the concentration of buffering agent, the more rapidly will a satisfactory pH be attained, resulting in more rapid dissolution of the bile acid or salt, resulting in a higher local concentration of the bile salt in solution, leading to greater efficacy in enhancing permeability to bioactive materials (see column 6, lines 14-19). The difference between the reference and the instant claims is that the reference does not teach propyl gallate or butyl hydroxyl anisole (BHA) and further addition of insulin sensitizing agent.

6. However, Desai teaches that other adjuvants for preserving the formulations are common in pharmaceutical formulations and antioxidants like butylated hydroxyanisole (BHA), butylated hydroxytoluene, d- α -tocopherol, and propyl gallate are commonly used in pharmaceutical compositions of insulin and other protein active ingredients (see

Art Unit: 1654

column 5, lines 5-18). Typical antioxidant concentrations can be used which is usually a standard practice; these can be from 0.1% to 1.5% (w/w or w/v). Desai further teaches a dosage unit pharmaceutical composition, adapted for oral administration, containing as active proteinaceous ingredients erythropoietin, insulin growth hormones, calcitonin, GCSF, cyclosporine, vasopressin or its agonists and antagonists...interferons or interleukins (see column 2, lines 13-18, and Examples 1-4).

7. Furthermore, Sonnenberg & Kotchen teach that troglitazone has been approved by the FDA for the treatment of type II diabetes. Sonnenberg & Kotchen teach that troglitazone produced a significant, dose-dependent reduction in glycosylated hemoglobin and fasting glucose concentrations despite decreases in insulin doses in clinical trials involving diabetic patients (see page 552).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add in antioxidants or preservatives, such as butyl hydroxyl anisole (BHA) or propyl gallate, since these additives are commonly used for preserving the pharmaceutical formulation, and prevent degradation, to enhance the longer shelf life of the proteinaceous ingredients. Furthermore, since New teaches the presence of sodium bicarbonate had beneficial effect by increasing the solubility of the bile acids to soluble bile salts and enhanced the permeability to bioactive materials (see New column 6, lines 4-7 and lines 17-19). Therefore, since New teaches the increased solubility of the bile acid or salt by sodium bicarbonate and teaches the pharmaceutical composition comprising an active macromolecule (insulin) and a non-conjugated bile acid or salt and sodium bicarbonate, it would have been obvious to add a well known antioxidant to preserve the

Art Unit: 1654

pharmaceutical formulation. Since combination of sodium bicarbonate (additive) increased the solubility of the bile acid, then combination of a known antioxidant into the formulation would also have the same solubility. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add in the antioxidants or preservatives to the pharmaceutical composition since these adjuvants would preserve the formulation, prevent degradation, and thus increase the shelf life of the pharmaceutical composition.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to maintain the pH of the intestinal fluid between pH 6.8 to 7.5, since New teaches that bile salts start to convert to its conjugate acid at pH of about 6.8 or below, and the acid form is insoluble in aqueous solution, and the buffering agent has the effect of buffering the compositions of the invention to a pH of about 7.5 or above, in which the solubilized bile salt will be present rather than the insoluble acid. One would be motivated to maintain the pH of the intestinal fluid not above pH 7.5, since New teaches that the bile salts begin to be converted to their conjugate acid at pH of about 6.8 or below and the acid form is insoluble in aqueous solutions (see New column 6, lines 6-8). New additionally teaches that the pH of the gut is between 5 to 7 (see column 4, lines 17-19). A solubilized bile salt will be able to act on the epithelial cells when in solution. There is a reasonable expectation of success, since the New reference teaches enhanced permeability of the bioactive agents by solubilizing the bile acids using the sodium bicarbonate, thus addition of an antioxidant (that prevents the degradation of peptide or protein in the pharmaceutical formulation) would also have the same solubility. Further, maintaining the intestinal fluid between pH 6.8 and 7.5 would allow the bile salt to be in

the soluble salt non-conjugated form to act on the epithelial cells when in solution in the intestinal fluid, which will lead to greater efficacy in enhancing permeability to bioactive materials, such as insulin and other protein drugs.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to add a known insulin sensitizing agent in the pharmaceutical composition, since Sonnenberg & Kotchen teach that troglitazone has been approved by the FDA for the treatment of type II diabetes. One of the ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to add a known insulin sensitizing agent in the pharmaceutical composition, since Sonnenberg & Kotchen teach that troglitazone produced a significant, dose-dependent reduction in glycosylated hemoglobin and fasting glucose concentrations despite decreases in insulin doses in clinical trials involving diabetic patients. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success, since the FDA has approved the use of troglitazone in combination with insulin, and has been shown to work in clinical trials involving diabetic patients. Therefore, the invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

9. Applicant argues that “there is nowhere at all in the cited prior art that suggest that the additive of claim 1 might have this effect of enhancing the solubility of a non-conjugated bile acid or salt.” Applicant further argues that “the ability of the additives of

claim 1 to exert this effect is unexpected because these additives have very poor solubility in water...moreover, while both are known antioxidants, their known use is preventing rancidity in oils and fats. The intestine, on the other hand, is an aqueous environment. Thus, no skilled person would have contemplated using BHA and PG in combination with non-conjugated bile acids and salts in an aqueous environment.” Applicant further argues that “something disclosed in the prior art cannot simply be modified by selectively replacing a particular feature with a different feature from another piece of prior art, when the feature in said other prior art is disclosed in a different context” in regards to "substituting propyl gallate for sodium". Applicant argues that “in the present case, in order to achieve the special effects that New set out to provide in the ‘748 Patent, it is essential that the composition comprises ‘an agent having ability to adjust the pH of the gut to a value of from 7.5 to 9’ This is the crucial teaching of New...clearly removing the agent would rob the composition of New of its essential properties.” Applicant further argues that "the Examiner has pieced together no less than four unrelated pieces of prior art in order to "arrive" at a composition of claim 1...this fact alone suggests the use of hindsight, which is not permitted in the assessment of inventive step.”

In regards to Desai et al, Applicant argues that “Desai describes compositions with a lipid component and a polyol component, which together form a microemulsion in the body after oral administration. The optional antioxidant mentioned at col. 5 lines 5-18 is specifically present only in the lipid component...the antioxidant will have an insignificant if any amount interaction with the aqueous part of the environment in the

Art Unit: 1654

microemulsion...the use of the antioxidant in Desai is entirely consistent with what BHA and PG are well known for, namely the prevention of rancidity in oils and fats.”

Furthermore, Applicant argues that “in the present invention involves the use of aromatic alcohols (such as the BHA and PG) in the aqueous environment of the intestine, in order to enhance the solubility of bile salts.” Applicant further argues that “there is no implication in Desai that the agents PG and/or BHA are common in formulations of insulin (or indeed other macromolecules), and so one skilled in the art would not have been inclined to include them in such a formulation on that basis.”

In regards to Makino et al, Applicant argues that “this document discusses formulation containing vitamin D3, a small water-insoluble molecule. It is very susceptible to oxidation and PG is mentioned as a possible antioxidant additive. Thus, it serves as an entirely different purpose compared to its use in the compositions of the present invention. There is no suggestion whatsoever that it could somehow improve bile salt solubility and thereby enhance absorption of a macromolecule.”

In regards to Modi et al, Applicant argues that “this document mentions that antioxidants may be added to the compositions mentioned...No mention at all is made of PG or BHA...”

In regards to pKa of PG, and PG as replacement of sodium bicarbonate, Applicant argues “the dissociation constant for sodium bicarbonate is over 60 times greater than that for PG...sodium bicarbonate is an inorganic compound, and the aromatic alcohol additives of claim 1 are completely different. This would clearly make PG an undesirable choice to replace sodium bicarbonate.”

Applicant further argues that “at page 8, the Examiner suggests it would be a necessary property of the composition not to raise the pH above 7.5 once it has been introduced into the intestine. No reasoning is given for this...It appears this suggestion has been made simply in order to “arrive” at a composition according to claim 1.”

10. Applicant’s arguments have been fully considered, but have not been found persuasive. In regards to Makino et al, Modi et al, pKa and PG as replacement of sodium bicarbonate are moot in view of the revised rejection described, supra.

In regards to “there is nowhere at all in the cited prior art that suggest that the additive of claim 1 might have this effect of enhancing the solubility of a non-conjugated bile acid or salt”, instant claim 1 does not recite the limitation that the additive enhances the solubility of a non-conjugated bile acid or salt. Instant claim 1 is drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a macromolecule, a non-conjugated bile acid or salt and (c) an additive. Additionally, the primary reference (New) teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising an active macromolecular polypeptide (insulin), a non-conjugated bile acid or salt and an additive (sodium bicarbonate). The addition of sodium bicarbonate increased the solubility of the bile salt, thereby increasing the permeability of the bioactive agents across the cell wall. Therefore, addition of a well known antioxidant (preservative) would have the same solubility.

In regards to the argument that “the ability of the additives of claim 1 to exert this effect is unexpected because these additives have very poor solubility in water...moreover, while both are known antioxidants, their known use is preventing

rancidity in oils and fats. The intestine, on the other hand, is an aqueous environment. Thus, no skilled person would have contemplated using BHA and PG in combination with non-conjugated bile acids and salts in an aqueous environment.” Again, Applicant is reminded that claim 1 is drawn to a pharmaceutical composition. The primary reference (New) teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising a macromolecular polypeptide (insulin), a non-conjugated bile acid or salt, and an additive (sodium bicarbonate) that increases the solubility of the non-conjugated bile acid, thus enhancing the permeability of the bioactive molecule. An addition of a well known antioxidant to the pharmaceutical composition that would preserve the formulation would have the same solubility, since the pharmaceutical composition having the sodium bicarbonate already increased the solubility of the bile acid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the well known antioxidant to the pharmaceutical formulation, since the secondary reference (Desai) teaches that these adjuvants preserve the pharmaceutical formulation, thus increasing the shelf-life of the proteinaceous bioactive agents.

In regards to the argument that “in the present case, in order to achieve the special effects that New set out to provide in the ‘748 Patent, it is essential that the composition comprises ‘an agent having ability to adjust the pH of the gut to a value of from 7.5 to 9’ This is the crucial teaching of New...clearly removing the agent would rob the composition of New of its essential properties” it would have been obvious to maintain the pH of the intestinal fluid in between pH 6.8 and 7.5, since New teaches that “bile salts start to be converted to their conjugate acid at pH of about 6.8 or below and

Art Unit: 1654

the acid form is insoluble in aqueous solutions.” New further teaches that pH of the gut is between 5 to 7, therefore, one would have been motivated to maintain the pH of about 7, which includes 7.5. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In regards to the argument that that “Desai describes compositions with a lipid component and a polyol component, which together form a microemulsion in the body after oral administration”, the primary reference teaches the components (a) and (b) of the instant and (c) an additive. The primary reference teaches that the additive is sodium bicarbonate, which increases the solubility of the non-conjugated bile acid or salt. Therefore, addition of well known antioxidants as preservative would have the same solubility. In regards to the argument that "in the present invention involves the use of aromatic alcohols (such as the BHA and PG) in the aqueous environment of the intestine, in order to enhance the solubility of bile salts...there is no implication in Desai that the agents PG and/or BHA are common in formulations of insulin (or indeed other macromolecules), and so one skilled in the art would not have been inclined to include them in such a formulation on that basis", Desai teaches that other adjuvants for preserving the formulations are common in pharmaceutical formulations (see column 5, lines 6-7) and some of the oil soluble antioxidants listed are butylated hydroxyanisole, butylated hydroxytoluene, d- α -tocopherol, propyl gallate, etc (see column 5, lines 16-18). The examples show different biologically active peptides (see column 2, lines 13-

18), such as insulin and d- α -tocopherol (part of the oil soluble antioxidant) (see Example 1); erythropoietin and d- α -tocopherol (see Example 2); human growth hormone and d- α -tocopherol (see Example 3); calcitonin and d- α -tocopherol (see Example 4).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use any of the oil soluble antioxidants listed. Further, the components (a) and (b) may already be in a solubilized form. There is no indication that (a) and (b) did not form a soluble formulation.

New Rejection-35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-14, 19-24, 26-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims 1 and 26 recite, "...when introduced into the intestine, dose not raise the pH of the intestinal fluid above pH 7.5." The phrase "the intestinal fluid above pH 7.5" is indefinite because although the upper limit is defined, the lower limit is not defined. Thus, the claims are indefinite. Because claims 2, 5-7, 9-14, 27-28, 31, 33-34 depend from indefinite claim 1 and do not clarify the point of confusion, and claims 19-24, 29-30, 32 and 35 depend from indefinite claim 26 and do not clarify the point of confusion, they must also be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Art Unit: 1654

13. Claims 9-11 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims recite, "...and derivatives and analogues thereof, either synthetic or from natural sources, conforming to structures derived from either human or animal origin..." This phrase is unclear. It is unclear what modifications are encompassed within the derivatives and analogues of the macromolecular principles, and what modifications are encompassed within derivatives or analogues conforming to structures derived from either human or animal origin.

Rejection-35 U.S.C. 112, 1st

14. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

15. Claims 9-11 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The MPEP states that the purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him. The courts have stated:

"To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by

Art Unit: 1654

describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966." Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include "level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient." MPEP 2163.

Further, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., the court stated:

"A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,' of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials. Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606; In re Smythe, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284-85 (CCPA 1973) ("In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus. . . ."). Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP further states that if a biomolecule is described only by a functional characteristic, without any disclosed correlation between function and structure of the sequence, it is "not sufficient characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence." MPEP 2163. The

MPEP does state that for generic claim the genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. MPEP 2163. If the genus has a substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within that genus. See MPEP 2163. Although the MPEP does not define what constitute a sufficient number of representative, the Courts have indicated what do not constitute a representative number species to adequately describe a broad generic. In Gostelli, the Court determined that the disclosure of two chemical compounds within a subgenus did not describe that subgenus. In re Gostelli, 872 F.2d at 1012, 10 USPQ2d at 1618.

In the instant case, the claims are drawn to an active macromolecular principle chosen from insulin, calcitonin, growth hormone, parathyroid hormone, erythropoietin, GLP-1 and GCSF, and derivatives and analogues thereof, either synthetic or from natural sources, conforming to structures derived from either human or animal origin. The generic statements derivatives and analogues thereof, either synthetic or from natural sources, conforming to structures derived from either human or animal origin do not provide ample written description for the compounds since the claims do not describe a single structural feature. The specification does not clearly define or provide examples of what qualify as compounds of the claimed invention.

As stated earlier, the MPEP states that written description for a genus can be achieved by a representative number of species within a broad generic. It is unquestionable claims 9-11 and 19-21 are broad generics with respect all possible compounds encompassed by the claims. The possible structural variations are limitless to any class of peptide or a peptide-like molecule that can form peptide or amide bonds

to make the variants or derivatives of the class of macromolecular polypeptides. It must not be forgotten that the MPEP states that if a peptide is described only by a functional characteristic, without any disclosed correlation between function and structure of the sequence, it is "not sufficient characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence." MPEP 2163. Here, though the claims may recite some functional characteristics, the claims lack written description because there is no disclosure of a correlation between function and structure of the compounds beyond compounds disclosed in the examples in the specification. Moreover, the specification lack sufficient variety of species to reflect this variance in the genus since the specification does not provide any examples of derivatives, analogues and sequence variants of the polypeptides. The specification is void of organic molecules that functions as a peptide-like molecule that qualify for the functional characteristics claimed as a peptide or a peptide-like molecule or other peptidic or peptidomimetic or amino acid mimetic molecules that can form peptide bonds to form peptide-like molecules, and other synthetic small molecules that can function as peptide-like molecules.

The specification is discloses that polypeptides and proteins such as insulin, calcitonin, human serum albumin, growth hormone...erythropoietins and EPO mimetics, colony stimulating factors including GCSF and GMCSF...GLP-1...enzymes including histone deacetylase, superoxide dismutase...collagen, elastin or fibronectin...antibody molecules...proteins or peptides containing antigenic epitopes and fragments, and derivatives, conjugates and sequence variants of any of the above (see pp. 3-4 of

Art Unit: 1654

specification). The working examples describes insulin as active macromolecular principle (see Examples 1, 6 and 8-9); calcitonin as active macromolecular principle (see Example 7). The specification does not describe any of the derivatives, conjugates, sequence variants or analogues of the polypeptides described. Description of insulin and calcitonin is not sufficient to encompass numerous other proteins that belong to the same genus. For example, there are varying lengths, varying amino acid compositions, and numerous distinct qualities that make up the genus. For example, human calcitonin has 93 amino acid residues (see GenBank Accession No. CAA26189). A derivative of calcitonin can have amino acid substitutions, deletions or additions and other modifications along the amino acid sequences. There are 20 naturally occurring amino acids, thus there are $93^{20} = 2.3 \times 10^{39}$ different possibilities. When non-natural amino acids (such as D-isomers, β -amino acids, γ -amino acids, ϵ -amino acids and modified amino acids) are factored into the equation, the numbers are innumerable. For a larger macromolecular protein such as growth hormone (GenBank Accession No. AAA49464) having 200 amino acids, there are $200^{20} = 1.05 \times 10^{46}$ different possibilities for naturally occurring amino acids alone. Therefore, the numbers of possibilities of derivatives, analogs or sequence variants of the polypeptides would increase according to the number of residues of that particular polypeptide. Therefore, there is not sufficient amount of examples provided to encompass the numerous characteristics of the whole genus claimed.

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention.

See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

(affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate"). Accordingly, it is deemed that the specification fails to provide adequate written description for the genus of the claims and does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the entire scope of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

16. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JULIE HA whose telephone number is (571)272-5982.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 1654

/Cecilia Tsang/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1654